MORALITY

An Individual Dilemma

ZAMAN ALI

MORALITY

An Individual Dilemma

Zaman Ali

Copyright © by ZAMAN ALI 2023

ISBN: 978-969-23195-5-3
LCCN: 2022915258

CNIC: 35202-9241648-1
Lahore Pakistan

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods, without the prior written permission of the publisher, and not even a brief quotation or a single line is allowed for copy.

Zaman Ali has the right to be
Identify as the author of this book. And "Library of Congress" recognizes this book copyright certification with author Zaman Ali.

First Printing in Lahore Pakistan by ZAMAN ALI

For permission requests, write to the publisher,
"Attention: For Permissions,"

Email:
zamanali.philosopher@gmail.com

Contents

What Matters

Defining Line

Formulating Absolute

Individual Responsibility

Individual Compromise

Individual vs Social Order

Problematic Good

Judgement Dilemma

Index

What Matters

The simplest question is: whether knowing all truth matters for living beings or not. Through observational understanding and with a few examples, the reasons suggest that for the living being, the truth is irrelevant. Like; each is entitled to live by one's own meaning, value, beliefs, and reasons and the question is; whether any meaning, value, belief, or reasons from which the individual is living is true or not. One answer is, it could be true to that individual, as one's own understanding suggests, it is true and they are living with these by considering it true. But the question is, is it true to any other individual, and another question is; that whatever the individual considers as true, is it objectively true or not, and then what is objective truth, and then how do we know what is regarded as the objective truth? Is objective truth the fundamental truth and then what is the fundamental truth and then how do we know what's fundamental? And yet there is no consensus about fundamentals, but we are living, without knowing one true fundamental and through considering many fundamentals as truth, which is constituted by many of us or simply by the majority or through someone whom others follow or according to one's own reasoning and faith, anyone could be living by any presumed fundamentals. Even though those fundamentals which one considers truth are in dispute with another one's reasoning and are in dispute with empirical knowledge, many times the idea of empirical knowledge itself is questioned because there are many questions regarding one's own senses and authenticating the

evidence through those senses. But yet the living person is living by all of their ideas, which could be true or false. But suppose anyone's idea is true and then any other one, who is not following those particular ideas, is living with the false idea, but yet they are living well, without knowing the truth in any regard about their meaning, value, and beliefs. So, one wonders; if the truth matters in living, and for these reasons, it is easy to suggest that the relevancy of truth with regard to living is not related. Rather, one could live by any idea which is either true or false, but still one could live well. So, the question comes to mind that if the truth is irrelevant to living, then what is it which matters? First, most people don't want to live without truth, if one comes to know any individual that one is living by untrue ideas, then that individual certainly wants to know the truth. But claiming anyone's idea as true and then let's suppose maybe that idea is true, but sooner one finds out, all sorts of epistemological challenges about the idea. And of course, not all ideas could be true, but yet with all different sorts of ideas individuals are living by them. And as it is observable that individuals could live without truth and when the truth becomes irrelevant then there must be any other thing, as fundamental and essential which must be needed for living. And, the question of; what matters for living and because for living one needs to acquire certain values, morals, and ethical standards. Because if nothing matters then acquiring any values, morals, and ethical standards becomes difficult. And how could one live as an individual when they are not certain about these questions, and individually one might live by any of these ideas because the truth is irrelevant. But what about society? Society is certainly doomed without any values, morals, and ethical standards. And when truth itself

is irrelevant then how could the individual operate in society, but still, we are living for a long enough time, which is the proof itself that without fundamental truth even societies operate and civilizations prosper, so there must be something else that matters for all of these and what that is if it's not the truth?

Now there are many opinions with rational justification, that this particular idea matters or that particular idea matters, and there are a lot of justifications for each one. Like; one considers certain beliefs to be right and assigns those beliefs some values and also considers them as the truth. It is true that one and one's own rationales justify, in their favor. Yet another one considers their own belief as truth, but the third one is just an observer and trying to find which one is right and true from those opinions which are considered as truth from each side. And that observer could provide their own judgment that both opinions are not true because each one's rationale doesn't justify according to the observer. Then immediately, the question arises upon the criteria of the observer and upon what ground the observer is challenging those opinions, and upon which standard this opinion is being judged. Then the process leads toward making the standard itself and of course, the standard itself will come from somewhere, and the question is who will decide about those standards and upon what basis those standards will be chosen. One answer is simple; if people agree upon any standard then it's good enough for them, but what happens if people don't agree to live by any standard, because of many reasons? Like; what is the basis for standards and defining

those fundamentals is difficult, especially when there is no agreement upon fundamentals by any particular means. Because one idea matters to a particular one and another idea to a particular other one and then the question is; why are all different matters particular rather than one general standard? Now, this leads toward the debate of particularity and its origin because then it seems like particularity itself is the reason which doesn't allow defining one standard for everyone. So, the simple question is; why is this and how do we erase those particular ideas which lead to division and endorse those ideas which matter? In doing this, the basic problem of defining what matters comes circle around upon the surface because defining what matters has its own problems. Of course, the truth matters, and truth leads toward defining everything else, but as there are questions about what is truth and how we know a particular idea is true and everything else is false. And each time when someone defines particular knowledge as truth, the different epistemological approaches stand against that particular idea. Like; mathematical calculation is considered true and arguing against this calculation seems impossible but the challenger provides reasons related to its completeness theorem, as still, it requires an outside entity to provide value to it and they could say the number itself is nothing rather it belongs to entities and when entities are involved then it provides some value which is incalculable and there are many other rationales which create skepticism even in mathematics. Now again the question arises upon the fundamentals and solving those fundamentals seems impossible as long as there isn't one known truth fulfilling each epistemological approach. Now suppose we all know one truth and there is no option

against it, because it is the known truth from all epistemological approaches and denying it, is simply impossible. Then what if someone's needs, interests, or desires contradict that truth and at the same time, that someone knows there is no harm in not living by the truth, rather either denying or living without that truth is better for one's own self? So, why does that someone needs to follow the truth, as contradicting it is good for oneself in all the possible practical ways? There are arguments against it; like; first simply, it is wrong to deny the truth, second when each one is following the truth then one who deviates from the truth has to be pointed out in some form. And then this whole notion means there are known universal truths and following that truth is the only way to live and no one has the option to deny that truth. Still, having and knowing the truth is different from imposing the truth, because as long as each one can choose otherwise despite knowing the truth. Then it becomes a matter of enforcement, when in fact anyone can by mistake or deliberately deny the truth for any reason which is right for oneself. Now because of one's ability to choose, the truth could become irrelevant despite being proven or known. Now suppose the choice isn't here, as the reason is a deterministic idea, and everyone is moving through the causal chain and still the deviant one isn't following the truth. Then through determinism, neither truth matters nor the choice matters, but because of determinism and the cause and effect chain, one is deviant from the others, so how do we address this issue, when determinism itself leads toward a deviant process in some people? Because still, society has to enforce the truth for any action which is harmful to others, and for that reason, enforcement comes into focus and when enforcement is here that means

the idea of truth comes into controversy. To avoid this controversy, we need to erase the idea of indeterminism, free will, probabilities, and possible outcomes and instead of these, we not only need determinism and it has to be without any probability or possibility in it. And now suppose we have determinism and there is no probability or possibility and each one's action is one universal truth without one's own control upon it and still one action is coming to harm the other one. Now does the one who gets hurt have any right to go against the one who somehow without any control over their action has been the cause of hurt? From this line of arguments, there is no reason to act against the one whose action causes the harm, but yet still one insists or demands to rectify that sort of action which causes the harm, even though it's not a deliberate choice of the one which causes that sort of harmful action. Now if the person who has harmed the other one, is not pointed out and doesn't get any punishment, then how do we live together, because it doesn't align with the idea of society even with the supposition of deterministic acts? Because even with the deterministic view, society still has to live by the rules of free will and needs to punish the people who cause harm, otherwise it could be difficult for its own survival, and for that reason, society has to point out those who don't abide by its rules even though any action they take isn't according to free will.

……

MORALITY
An Individual Dilemma

The problem is not only with what's right and wrong but the problem is with who decides about what's right and wrong.

The question is not only about; what actions are good and what is regarded as good. Rather the question is; what is the basis for good and from where it comes and is being good, right or not? These questions are not only necessary for thinking about morality, rather it's also led toward questioning the good of everything here.

As the questions are already been asked, so the question is; can the question itself be protected or not? And for us the question itself belongs with our own individuality and provides reasons to questions and understanding, that's why protecting it becomes necessary.

The problem isn't not only with what's right and wrong but the problem is with who decides about what's right and wrong.

The question is not only about; what actions are good and what is regarded as good. Rather the question is; what is the basis for good and from where it comes and is being good, right or not? These questions are not only necessary for thinking about morality, rather it's also led toward questioning the good of everything here.

As the questions are already been asked, so the question is; can the question itself be protected or not? And for us the question itself belongs with our own individuality and provides reasons to questions and understanding, that's why protecting it becomes necessary.

ISBN 978-969-23195-5-3

9 789692 319553